

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,551	08/05/2003	Tadashi Ohashi	1341.1159	6667

21171 7590 09/17/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

RIMELL, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/633,551

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Sam Rimell

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) \*
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2175

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1: The phrase “the set element” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 3: Claim 3 is generally incomprehensible. As understood, the claim appears to be suggesting that a name be added to the name ontology, without changing the ontology itself, which is not logically possible.

Claim 7: The phrase “searched for/referred to” is indefinite, as it is not clear whether one or both alternatives are required.

Claim 9: The phrase “the set element” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 10: The phrase “the set element” lacks antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

---

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Makus et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication US2002/0059210).

Claim 1: FIGS. 3-8 illustrate a graphical user interface of a computer system such as a PDA (paragraph 0038). The “installation space” is the memory of the PDA.

As seen in FIG. 3 a specific element “Travel and Transport” is set (selected) by the user. Setting (selecting) this specific element triggers the generation of a hierarchically grouped set of names under the specific element “Travel and Tourism”. The hierarchical grouping of names shown in FIGS. 3-8 is itself a “name space ontology”, since an ontology is nothing more than a set of relationships between objects.

The set element is the specific element “Travel and Transport” and appears at the top of the ontology.

Each name in the ontology is linked to a lowest level in the hierarchy, shown in FIG. 8. This lowest level displays multi-media information, including a symbol (87), a telephone number and a website address.

Claim 2: The actual ontology which is generated depends on the set element. For example, when the set element is “Travel and Transport”, the specific ontology illustrated in FIGS. 3-8 is produced. Different ontologies are produced when different names are selected.

~~Claim 3: As stated above, claim 3 is generally incomprehensible. It is observed that the reference to Makus does suggest employing names in an ontology (a hierarchical grouping).~~

Claim 6: Names in the ontologies can include extensions. In FIG. 4, the name “Airlines” can include the extension “Major” or “Regional”. Extensions can also be considered names which are below a given name in the hierarchy. For example, in FIG. 5, the name “Airlines-International” could have the extension “Aer Lingus Irish” or the extension “Aero California”.

Art Unit: 2175

Claim 7: The computer program illustrated in FIGS. 3-5 illustrates a “security gate” in the sense that once a name is selected, only specific names are presented to the user. For example, in FIG. 3, if the user selects “Aviation”, they are only presented aviation listings, and are not given access to maritime or weather information until they return to the home page.

Claim 8: In FIGS. 5-8, users traverse down the ontology and thus perform a search for the multi-media information shown in FIG. 8. FIG. 8 shows the output of the search where the search has been performed. The search is limited to aviation information and other available information, such as maritime and weather information is not presented.

Claim 9: The setting unit is the programming which allows the user to select a top level name, such as “Travel and Transport”. The generating unit is the graphical user interface of the PDA. The linking unit is the programming that organizes the names into a hierarchy, which is the same as an ontology.

Claim 10: See remarks for claim 9.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

~~(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.~~

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makus et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication US2002/0059210) in view of Chaudhuri et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication US2004/0003005).

Claims 4: Makus et al. differs in that it does not disclose the detection of duplicate names.

Art Unit: 2175

Chaudhuri et al. teaches the concept of detecting duplicates in hierarchically arranged data in a database (paragraph 0012, lines 4-7). The purpose of the detection is to eliminate duplicates (paragraph 0004, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the program of Makus et al. to include the duplicate detection arrangement of Chaudhuri et al. in order to identify and eliminate duplicates of data presented to the user, as taught by Chaudhuri et al.

Claim 5: A domain can be a portion of the ontology, such as all the names under the heading "Aviation", illustrated by Makus et al. in FIGS. 4-8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (703) 306-5626.



Sam Rimell  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2175